

CalRecycle / Division of Recycling  
 Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Program  
 Program Reform - Focus Group Workshop #4  
 Requested Actions and Parking Lot Items

PARKING LOT ITEMS		Assigned	Note
Workshop # 4 – October 3-4, 2012 – Parking Lot Items			
FGW4.PL: 1) Need to remove statutorily defined use of weighted average in processing payment calculations - use a simple average.			
FGW4.PL: 2) The relationship of handling fees and processing payments impact on the mix of CZ non-CZ Recycling Centers needs to be considered when making any adjustment to processing payments made to Recycling Centers that are not CZs.			
FGW4.PL: 3) In traditional bottle bills (Michigan, Iowa) the form in which the containers are eligible for redemption excludes the redemption of crushed or flattened containers. Also in these states they must separate the containers by brand. Both factors increase program costs as compared to California.			
FGW4.PL: 4) Change admin fee so it is no longer a percentage.			
FGW4.PL: 5) Fraud is a contributing factor to the structural deficit.			
FGW4.PL: 6) Scavenging - stats for curbside collection of UBC material are going down, while buy-back redemption in the Program is going up. Scavenging represents a material portion of that buy-back redemption material. This creates an imbalance in local jurisdiction funding that has negative impacts on the citizens.			
FGW4.PL: 7) Need a review of program operations to determine what efficiencies can be achieved thus lowering overall costs. This is a topic for the October 25 Workshop.			
FGW4.PL: 8) Processing payments and processing fees (including cost and scrap value surveys) should be audited on a regular basis by the Bureau of State Audits.			

**CalRecycle / Division of Recycling**  
**Beverage Container Recycling and Litter Reduction Program**  
 Program Reform - Focus Group Workshop #4  
 Requested Actions and Parking Lot Items

REQUESTED ACTION ITEMS	Assigned	Note
Workshop # 4 – October 3-4, 2012 – Requested Action Items		
FGW4.AI: 1) The dynamic nature of the revenue stream to the Program based on different material types could cause unanticipated reduction in revenues based in the changes of the mix of materials. Need a model to analyze the potential impacts. Clarification: Any change to program payments which results in packaging changes could have unanticipated changes in revenues. This should be included in all modeling.		
FGW4.AI: 2) What is the combined material blended rate? (The blended rate would equal all CRV paid in divided by total containers for a per-container rate program-wide.)		
FGW4.AI: 3) What is the percentage of all CRV paid into the fund for containers that are 24oz or less and containers that are >24oz? (This is program-wide and not material-specific.) Report this as a proportion of all containers.		
FGW4.AI: 4) Produce a chart for each of the scenarios presented on the idea/topic list for raising, lowering, and offsetting CRV values to demonstrate what recycling rate will achieve break-even for the fund. Include 3-4 examples of increased recycling rates and what it would do to the bottom line.		
FGW4.AI: 5) Upcoming workshop on comingled rates - show mathematically how high aluminum and PET recycling rates can occur without assuming fraud.		
FGW4.AI: 6) What is the estimated amount of fraud in the Michigan deposit program?		
FGW4.AI: 7) Analysis demonstrating the impacts of wine and spirit containers on ratio of over and under 24 containers and CRV value in the Program for individual material types and combined (program wide).		
FGW4.AI: 8) Analysis of the impact lowering CRV rates would have on the fund imbalance - use 2000 recycling rates and add to existing chart.		
FGW4.AI: 9) What is BOEs estimated rate of unpaid sales tax for dealers that they currently monitor for sales tax? Can BOE identify dealers specifically in their systems? This would provide an estimate of potential unredeemed CRV from the same dealers.		